

that does not agree in the slightest degree with the generic character, which is that of a cylindrical branched sponge. I can only suppose that they had intended to figure the calcareous one and forgot it, and then somehow mixed up the two sponges together; at any rate, there is no doubt that by the law of priority the name of *Alcyoncellum* belongs to the calcareous Australian sponge, as, I think, Dr. Bowerbank must admit.

To add to the confusion, M. Milne-Edwards, in the second edition of Lamarck's work, published in 1834, seeing that the figures and the generic characters in MM. Quoy and Gaimard's work did not agree, instead of giving a new generic name to the sponge figured, gave a new character to the genus *Alcyoncellum*, evidently taken from MM. Quoy and Gaimard's plate. Thus he lost the credit of establishing the genus that was afterwards named *Euplectella*, though in fact he did establish it under a name used for a different sponge.

*On an accidental case of Monœciousness in Cœlebogyne.*

By H. BAILLON.

The author showed to the French Academy some monœcious branches of *Cœlebogyne ilicifolia*, Sm., bearing at the same time female flowers, ripe and entire fruits, fruits open to give issue to perfectly formed seeds, and, at their upper part, thousands of male flowers with the anthers full of pollen. The specimens formed part of a collection of Euphorbiaceæ sent from Australia for determination by Dr. F. Müller, and were collected at Rockhampton in the wild state.

The author remarks that the slight value of the genus *Cœlebogyne*, and the frequency of such anomalies in other genera to which its species might be referred (*Cladodes*, *Alchornea*, *Aparisthium*), had led him to predict that, sooner or later, cases of hermaphroditism or monœciousness would be detected in this plant. This prediction was already fulfilled as to hermaphrodite flowers. The present demonstration of the existence of accidentally monœcious flowers gives, in his opinion, the last blow to the doctrine of parthenogenesis.—*Comptes Rendus*, May 4, 1868, p. 856.

*Note on a Double Egg of a Fowl.*

*To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.*

GENTLEMEN,—A friend, residing in the Cuddupah district, in the Madras Presidency, has sent me a boiled fowl's egg which contains a smaller egg with a shell. It had been cooked for his breakfast.

Eggs with a double yelk I have several times seen; but I have never seen or heard before of a perfect egg inside another: it therefore appears desirable that it should be recorded in the 'Annals.'

I am, Gentlemen,

Very truly yours,

J. MITCHELL, Captain.

Ootacamund, Sept. 1, 1868.

Sup. of the Madras Museum.